

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached REPLACEMENT SHEET replaces the reference character “20” with reference character “16” in FIGS. 9A, 9B and 9C. This sheet replaces the original drawing sheet having FIGS. 9A, 9B and 9C.

Attachment: REPLACEMENT SHEET

REMARKS

Applicants are filing this Response within the shortened statutory period. Consequently, Applicants believe that no fee is due with this filing; however, if a fee is due please charge Deposit Account No. 502295.

Claims 1-30 were presented for examination. The final Office Action dated April 10, 2007 rejects claims 1-30. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 2, 5, 13-20 and 25 to more clearly recite Applicants' invention. Applicants herein cancel claims 21-24. Claims 1-20 and 25-30 remain pending in the application.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "20" was used to designate both "viewer display" in FIG. 1 and "sharer display" in FIGS. 9A-9C. As instructed in the Office Action, reference character "20" has been replaced with reference character "16" in FIGS. 9A-9C as now set forth in the attached "REPLACEMENT SHEET." In light of the amendment to the drawings, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to because paragraph [00036] recites "step 110 of FIG. 6" instead of "step 110 of FIG. 7." In addition, the specification is objected to because paragraph [00037] recites "sharer display 20" instead of "sharer display 16" in order to be consistent with FIG. 1. Applicants have amended the specification accordingly and request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn. For consistency, Applicants have also amended paragraph [00038] herein to replace "sharer display 20" with "sharer display 16."

Rejection of Claims 17-26 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 17-26 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 17-20 to replace "computer program product" with "computer storage medium" as advised by the Office Action therefore

Applicants submit that these claims as amended overcome the rejection. Applicants herein cancel claims 21-24 thereby rendering their rejection moot.

The Office Action states that a person of ordinary skill in the art can reasonably broadly interpret the sharer processor, shared data generator and viewer processor elements recited in claims 25, 26 and 28-30 to be nothing more than program modules or functional descriptive materials. Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation. Applicants submit that an interpretation that limits the sharer processor, shared data generator and viewer processor to program modules is actually an unreasonably narrow interpretation. Moreover, Applicants have not set forth in the specification any teaching or suggestion that should result in a limitation to such a narrow interpretation. Instead, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the recited elements can be implemented as discrete hardware components or subcomponents of a computer system. The sharer processor can be implemented, for example, in the processor 30 shown for the personal computer (PC) of FIG. 2. Similarly, the viewer processor can be implemented in display processing hardware or image processing hardware such as a graphics processing unit resident on a PC or display unit as is known in the art. Thus Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 25, 26 and 28-30 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 18, 21, 22 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 18, 21, 22 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,156 to Beard et al. (hereafter “Beard”). Claims 21 and 22 are canceled herein therefore the rejection against these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is rendered moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the claims as amended because the cited reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants’ claimed invention.

Applicants’ invention relates to a method of sharing a portion of a sharer display with viewer displays. A display allocation is determined for viewer displays and a sharing area is determined according to the display allocations. The sharing area “tracks” the position of a cursor in the sharer display. Display data within the sharing area are sent to the viewer displays and presented to viewers. The sharing area can be updated (i.e., increased or decreased in dimensional size) when the display allocation of a viewer display changes, when

a viewer leaves the sharing session, or a new viewer joins the sharing session. Optionally, a sharing frame can be presented on the sharing display to indicate the perimeter of the sharer display that is shown on the viewer displays.

Representative claim 1 as now set forth recites “determining, for a plurality of viewer displays, a display allocation for each viewer display” and “determining a sharing area defining a portion of the sharer display to be shown on the viewer displays based on the display allocations for the viewer displays”

Beard discloses a method for synchronizing the display of an application between a host and guest computers. The available display areas for the computers are generally unequal. According to Beard, the host computer can send a command to the guest computers to alter the guest displays based on a movable point in the output display of the host computer. In addition, a guest computer can send a request to the host computer to enable the guest computer to update the displays of the other guest computers according to a movable point on the monitor of the requesting guest computer.

Beard acknowledges that users must restrict their machine configurations when sharing applications (col. 2, lines 25-28) or manually adjust their displays (col. 4, lines 49-67) to deal with the mismatched display areas, but Beard provide no information on how this is done. More specifically, Beard does not teach or suggest (1) the determination of display allocations from the guests and (2) determining the sharing area to be shown on guest displays based on the display allocation data.

As Beard does not teach or suggest each and every limitation in claim 1 as now set forth, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn. Independent claims 17 and 25 as now set forth include similar language to representative claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least those reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 5, 18 and 26-28 depend directly or indirectly from the patentable independent claims 1, 17 and 25, and incorporate all of the limitations of the respective independent claim. Therefore Applicants submit that these dependent claims are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least those reasons provided in

connection with claim 1, and Applicants request that the rejection against these dependent claims also be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3, 6-16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 6-16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard in view of one or more of the following secondary references: U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0210281 to Ellis et al. (hereafter “Ellis”); U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 B1 to Salesky et al. (hereafter “Salesky”); and U.S. Patent No. 7,130,461 B2 to Rosenholtz (hereafter “Rosenholtz”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained against the claims as amended because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants’ claimed invention. Claims 23 and 24 are canceled herein therefore the rejection against these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is rendered moot.

For at least the reasons given above, independent 1, 17 and 15 are allowable. The secondary references are used in the Office Action to show one or more limitations that are recited in the identified dependent claims and that are not taught or suggested by Beard. The secondary references; however, do not teach or suggest the limitations discussed above that are not taught or suggested by Beard. As claims 3, 6-16, 19, 20, 29 and 30 depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 1, 17 and 25, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are also allowable. Thus Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 6-16, 19, 20, 29 and 30 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 7, 2007
Reg. No. 41,047

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/William G. Guerin/
William G. Guerin
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752